

Fall Issue

The C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*

A Publication

Of The

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION

OF

UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

VOLUME 9 NUMBER 1
OCTOBER 1960

C.A.U.T. MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS

<i>ASSOCIATION</i>	<i>Membership (1959-60)</i>	<i>President</i>	<i>Officers (1960-61) Secretary</i>
Victoria	59	R. J. Bishop	Mrs. G. D. Kennedy
U.B.C.....	588	C. Belshaw	P. R. Robert
Alberta.....	273	H. Kreisel	J. S. Kennedy
Saskatchewan.....	237	J. G. Rempel	R. Skinner
Brandon.....	18	W. Wong	G. MacDowell
St. John's.....	19	J. W. S. Jamieson	B. G. M. Wood
United.....	34	A. G. Bedford	W. C. Campbell
Manitoba	281	W. H. Lucow	R. D. Connor
Assumption.....			John F. Sullivan
Western.....	141	R. W. Torrens	R. W. Packer
Waterloo.....	35	R. G. Woolford	J. D. Ford
Waterloo Lutheran	36		Mrs. J. R. Briggs
McMaster.....	116	H. E. Duckworth	D. D. Stewart
O.A.C.....	187	D. Waghorne	G. I. Trant
O.V.C.....	52	F. J. Milne	T. J. Hulland
Toronto	472	R. M. Saunders	M. F. Grapko
Queen's	120	H. R. S. Ryan	C. H. R. Campling
Carleton.....	67	L. Read	D. Wiles
Ottawa	20	Dalton McGuinty	Brian Robinson
Montreal	192	J.-P. Lussier	André Morel
McGill.....	352	M. Cohen	F. S. Howes
Sir Geo. Wms.....	43	W. F. Black	Paul Widdows
Jean de Brébeuf.....		Jacques Lavigne	Paul Painchaud
Bishop's.....	21	D. C. Masters	A. J. Motyer
Laval.....	190	G. Filteau	E. Gosselin
U.N.B.....	80	H. J. Whalen	Miss C. MacLaggen
Mount Allison.....	54	Ross Barclay	H. A. MacLean
Acadia.....	13	N. H. Morse	Miss Jean Marsh
St. Francis X.....	23	W. J. Woodfine	David Bunbury
Dalhousie.....	59	A. R. Bevan	R. V. Webber
St. Mary's.....			J. R. MacCormack
Nova Scotia Tech.....		Gilbert F. Vail	Oswald Kroep
Memorial.....	62	P. Copes	O. K. Crocker

Individual members

Lakehead.....	10	W. D. MacKinnon	T. B. Miller
Sherbrooke.....	1		

31 Aug. 1960: Total membership: 3856

No. of Associations: 33

Fall Issue

The C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*

A publication of

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Volume 9

November 1960

Number 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Second Decade — An Editorial	2
The Reform of University Government — An Editorial	4
F. S. Howes — An Editorial	5
Report of the Executive Secretary	6
The Crowe Case Yet Again	3
A Contingency Fund	9
The Annual Meeting at Kingston	9
The Reform of University Government	10
Staffing Canadian Summer Schools	35
Schedule of Minimum Salaries 1960-61	42

Published four times a year. Subscription Rate: 1 year for \$2.00.
Executive Secretary: Dr. J. H. S. Reid, CAUT National office, Room 603,
Commonwealth Bldg., 77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ont.

Editor: S. R. Mealing, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ont.

Advertising Office: Suite 611, 1030 St. Alexander St., Montreal, P. Q.

Telephone: UNiversity 6-1812.

Printed by Quality Press Limited, 1030 St. Alexander St., Montreal.

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa

THE SECOND DECADE

An Editorial

It was at the Royal Military College, Kingston, during the 1950 meetings of the Royal Society, that a few people, less than a dozen, met together to consider the desirability of organizing Canadian University Teachers on a professional basis. There was nothing at all formal about the occasion, but those who were there agreed to take the idea back to their campuses. And so at the Annual Meeting of the CAUT at Queen's this summer, we were, without most of us knowing it, celebrating the tenth anniversary of our beginnings.

The CAUT was formally brought into being during the meetings of the Learned Societies at McGill in 1951. Already during the year since the meeting in Kingston, seven local associations had been formed and in addition, there were a good many individuals across the country who were eager to associate themselves with the new organization. By January 1953 when the first number of the CAUT Bulletin was issued, there were local units at 13 Universities and Colleges. Now there are 33 with a collective membership which is at least 80% of all the full-time university teachers in Canada! This would seem to set some sort of record for group response.

Everything about the CAUT at the outset was strictly amateur. The constitution which covered less than a page was so lacking in guidance that nearly anything was legitimate. The flexibility was delightful. All of the work was done on a voluntary basis and it was amazing how well and how promptly it got done. And the membership fee was just \$2 which perhaps says more clearly than any number of words why we were a push-over for the organizers. Two dollars was about all most of us could afford!

From the outset the CAUT has been a liaison body. Its role has been to discover and make known to us our common problems — more particularly those problems which must be solved on a national basis if they are to be

solved at all. If one looks back to what our incomes and conditions of work were ten years ago, one is immediately impressed with the improvement which has taken place in nearly every phase of our academic lives.

From the beginning we talked about the need for a National Office with a full-time Executive Secretary. However, that had to wait until we had become psychologically conditioned to the notion that the boot-straps by which we were pulling ourselves up could be at least partly automated if we were willing to apply some "feedback" ie., pay for assistance. And as the conditioning process matured, we raised our contribution to the CAUT from \$2 to \$3 to \$7 and by that last tug, we actually reached the National Office level and appointed a full-time Executive Secretary.

This past year has been a delight for local secretaries. Information has poured in from HQ. Letters to the National Office have been answered with startling promptness even though — as often as not, the Secretary was off on a trip. And that was another good thing — we began to hear, first hand, what was "cooking" at Queen's on salaries; at Manitoba on University Government; at Saskatchewan on pensions. And we learned also what was going on in Ottawa of interest to university teachers, for the Secretary, located at the centre of things, was a sensitive listening post for matters academic.

At the June Council meetings which were attended by representatives of 27 local units, the National Officers, Committee members, alternates and guests — more than 60 people altogether, one had the impression that this was no longer a group of amateurs bumbling along. We had arrived. The University Teaching Profession in Canada is well organized; it knows what its objectives are and the direction in which it must move to realize them. And it is moving steadily in that direction.

Perhaps it was this confident awareness which, along toward the end of the meeting, resulted in one motion being passed with little discussion and only one dissenting vote. This was a motion to raise the membership fee from \$7 to \$10 effective September 1st.

Just as the \$2 fee in 1951 was a measure of the state of our academic beings then, so this \$10 fee represents where we are now. The extra money will be used to build up a small reserve of working capital so that we are no longer carrying on a marginal, hand-to-mouth operation. To do a still better job and to have some reserve for contingencies — these objectives met with nearly unanimous approval at the meeting and must commend themselves to all who are thinking in terms of the future welfare of the university teaching profession and of the universities.

So be prepared fellow member — \$10 for National and \$X for Local. Let us start the second decade right by casting a bit more bread upon the waters. We have always received back more than we gave and recently it has begun to taste like cake. In any case it's not much of a risk, for the total cost per day will still be less than a four cent stamp!

THE REFORM OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

An Editorial

The greater part of this issue is given over to the report of a C. A. U. T. committee on university government. It is a tentative report, not adopted by the Executive Council at its June meeting but received as a basis for discussion. The Council did approve the principle of greater faculty participation in university government. The same question is now before the Council of the American Association of University Professors, and its tentative statement of principles will be reprinted in the December issue of this *Bulletin*. In an age, and on a continent, so characteristically devoted to self-government, there can be no question that the constitution of our universities presents a strange anomaly. In form at least, no other sort of community among us is so subjected to outside control. The only question is whether the anomaly justifies itself in

practice. In our December issue the President Emeritus of the University of Saskatchewan will argue that it does. The authors of the present report think that it does not, and particularly that it "unwittingly militates against the free search for truth and the free expression of thought". Even the most private of universities performs a public function and must be responsive to the public interest. Does that interest require lay control, or is it enough that even a self-governing university would be dependent on public funds and therefore on public confidence? Are academics, more than other people, unfit to govern themselves? If so, who is better fitted to govern them? How much freedom do academics need and is it now secured for them? Upon these questions the academic profession in Canada has a special and pressing obligation to make up its mind.

F. S. HOWES

An Editorial

The present issue of the *Bulletin* is the first to be issued under a new editor. Ever since the first issue appeared in January 1953, *Bulletin* material has been collected, edited — and often largely written — by a committee at McGill University headed by Professor Fred Howes. At the Council Meeting in June at Kingston, Professor Howes was presented with a bound edition of all *Bulletins* to date and the Council passed an unanimous vote of thanks to him for his services.

If any one can be called a founding father of C.A.U.T. it would surely be Fred Howes. No one in Canada has done more for the Association. Professor Howes was president for two years, has been editor of the *Bulletin* for seven, and has been a member of the executive ever since the beginning of the Association. His colleagues and friends from Victoria to St. John's, Newfoundland, are grateful to him for the energy, the initiative and the moderate common sense which he invariably brought to C.A.U.T. matters.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

to the June 1960 Council Meetings

On September 6, 1959, C.A.U.T. opened its new national office in the Commonwealth Building, 77 Metcalfe Street, in Ottawa. The Association was fortunate in being able at that time to secure the services, as Assistant Secretary, of Mrs. Elsie Southwell, formerly a secretary in the offices of N.C.C.U. Largely as a result of her energy and experience the office was very quickly in operation.

A very large part of the work of the office has been of a routine nature and includes a great deal of correspondence with local associations, with individual members, with committee chairmen and with the score of other organizations in Canada and elsewhere with whom we have dealings. It should be noted that in the case of any correspondence in which the policy of the Association is being stated or being formed, Thermo-Fax copies go to the President, and if he wishes, to all other members of the Executive and Finance Committee as well. From my point of view at least, the basis that has been worked out for co-operation with the elected officers of the Association has proven to be very satisfactory.

Keeping adequate records of Association finances and building up reasonably comprehensive files are other time-consuming but necessary tasks. It is my belief that the collection and cataloguing of detailed and complete information about conditions of employment and tenure at each of the Canadian universities should be the first major job of the new office, and the questionnaire which all associations received in March is one of the means by which we hope to secure that information. Not all association secretaries have returned the completed questionnaire as yet.

During the past few months I have visited and had meetings with the executive officers and/or the general membership of every local association but one. Whether these visits have been of benefit to the local associations is not for me to say, but they have certainly taught me a great deal. Several observations I think I can make as a result of these visits:—

1. There is a tremendous amount of interest everywhere in Canadian university circles in the subject of university government. Many associations have committees at work and studies under way; some have already made proposals for reform to the provincial or other authorities; and some have in the past year succeeded in bring-

ing about needed changes in the structure of their own universities. A national C.A.U.T. committee under the chairmanship of Professor Don Rowat of Carleton will be reporting further on this matter.

2. Interest remains strong in the work of C.A.U.T. in collecting salary information, etc. It is clear, however, that associations now are looking for more detailed information on salaries than we have so far been supplying. The mere announcement of a minimum salary for a particular professorial grade is no longer sufficient. What is needed, if we are to meet the requests for information now being received, is a fairly comprehensive survey showing the distribution of actual salaries paid within each grade. Another matter in which there is considerable interest is the possibility of compiling comparative tables on salaries of teachers in medical schools, at least at the pre-clinical level.

3. There is a great deal of interest in the possibility of gaining more adequate pension provisions as well. Particularly is there evident a desire for more readily "portable" pensions. There was widespread interest in Canada — and not only on the part of local associations — in the Saskatchewan pension proposals.

4. Many local associations are displaying considerable interest in what might be properly called professional matters. Several have committees at work or studies under way on such matters as admission requirements, scholarship provision and programmes, policy on future growth of the university, etc., etc. At least two associations have interested themselves in the cases of academic persons who have had difficulties with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and the Executive and Finance Committee has in one of these cases publicly stated a C.A.U.T. policy. Many individual members have expressed the view that the time has come when we must decide what is to be our policy about speaking for our profession on matters of public interest.

In addition to the visits to the local associations, I paid a visit in February to the offices of the American Association of University Professors in Washington, and Professor Good and I attended the annual meetings of the A.A.U.P. in Detroit in April. We were very warmly welcomed and were given every opportunity to observe and learn from the deliberations of that body. It is obvious that increasing cooperation between the two bodies will prove of great benefit to us. Already a great deal of extremely valuable information has come to us from the Washington officers. It is quite clear that we have much in common with the A.A.U.P. Its members face the same

problems and the same difficulties as we do; its discussions produce very much the same proposals. I was struck by two very obvious differences between the A.A.U.P. and C.A.U.T.: — (1) The American association is far more highly centralized than is C.A.U.T. and there is nothing like the autonomy of the local associations which characterizes our federation. (2) Investigations into cases of alleged violation of academic freedom and tenure continue to occupy by far the largest part of the time and energies of the A.A.U.P. and its office staff. This is not the case in Canada.

Relations with NCCUC and C.U.F. continue to be cordial, although we were not able to secure favourable replies to the two requests we made during the year. The staff of the NCCUC-CUF office were most helpful to us in the matter of setting up our office, and both Dr. Matthews and Dr. Sheffield have been more than co-operative. The officers and the members of the associations at Carleton and at the University of Ottawa have given us a great deal of help in many ways.

I would urge C.A.U.T. members to call at the office whenever they are in Ottawa and to use it in every possible way. And I would remind the local associations that we will be able to circulate the fullest and most valuable information about university faculty developments only if we receive it in the first place. Reports of committees, descriptions of local projects, resolutions on policy of the university and resolutions for discussion at the national association meetings — in general, news of the associations' activities — these are the matters we would like to know about.

J. H. STEWART REID,
Executive Secretary.

May 26th, 1960

THE CROWE CASE YET AGAIN

Last winter the Council drew the attention of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Universities Foundation to those former United College teachers who, having resigned on a matter of principle, were still without permanent teaching posts. This is the reply:

"The Board of Directors of the Canadian Universities Foundation, at a meeting held on November 25, 1959, considered the resolution of the CAUT Council concerning former members of the teaching staff at United College.

The Board noted your resolution, but decided that at the present time it would take no action in this matter."

A CONTINGENCY FUND

At Saskatoon in June 1958 the council decided to raise a fund to cover the out-of-pocket expenses incurred by members involved in the United College Case. Any surplus was to be used to create a standing contingency fund. Since then resolutions from the Carleton and Manitoba Associations have called for a fund, the purpose of which would be to contribute not only to the expenses but if necessary to the support of any university teacher dismissed without cause. At Kingston in June 1960 the Council decided that this wider object should be adopted, although not by the creation of a special fund. The following resolution was carried:

"...that, if in the opinion of the Council the situation warrants it, the necessary legal and other expenses of a member whose academic freedom or tenure has been violated or improperly threatened may be paid in whole or in part out of the general reserves of the Association; and that the Council may also direct the payment of an assistance allowance for a period of up to a year for a member who has lost his post as a result of such a contingency and has been unsuccessful in finding another position."

THE ANNUAL MEETING AT KINGSTON

The 1960 Annual Meeting welcomed the affiliation of four new associations: at Assumption University, Collège Jean de Brébeuf, Nova Scotia Technical College and St. Mary's University. Change being the concomittant of growth, it also concurred in the Council's decision to adopt a new constitution. It recommended however that Article 17 of the new document be amended, so that the Annual Meeting could initiate constitutional changes. Professor Keppel-Jones in his formal address explained the objects of the new Commonwealth Association, a body representing university teachers throughout the whole Commonwealth area. The C. A. U. T. is, with its counterparts in Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, a member of the new body.

Professor H. M. Good (Queen's) is succeeded as President by Professor J. H. Aitchison (Dalhousie). The other members of the new executive are C. L. Barber (Manitoba) as Past President; J. W. O'Brien (Sir George Williams) as Secretary; W. J. McDougall (Carleton) as Treasurer; and Alexander Brady (Toronto), E. Gosselin (Laval) and A. W. R. Carrothers (U. B. C.) as Vice Presidents.

THE REFORM OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

A Statement by the Committee on University Government Presented to the Executive Council of the Canadian Association of University Teachers As a Basis for Discussion June 12, 1960

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. The Need For Reform	10
2. Desirable Principles	19
3. Application of the Principles	20
1) Financial Independence	21
2) The Governing Body	22
3) Ultimate Powers of Faculties	26
4) Composition of Senates	27
5) Offices of President and Dean	28
6) Limits on Powers of Administrative Officers	29
7) Collective Authority of Departments	32
8) Role of the Faculty Association	34
4. The Achievement of Reform	34

1. The Need for Reform

Many people realized even before the recent dispute arose at United College that something is radically wrong with the system of university government in Canada. The dispute was nonetheless a dramatic demonstration of the disastrous results that such a system can bring about, and awakened us to the fact that something must be done.

Briefly, what is wrong is this: the essential function of university scholars is to pursue and propagate the truth as they see it, freely and without fear or favour; yet in Canada they are hired, paid, governed and controlled by an outside body whose members may have particular interests to protect or promote. Most of these members have never been scholars themselves (except briefly as undergraduates), and many understand neither the nature of scholarly work nor the conditions required to foster it. Moreover, at the provincial universities, where the government of the day, representing a particular political party, appoints not only a majority of the governing board, but usually also the chairman of the board and in some cases even the president, there is a constant danger of political interference in university affairs. And since *all* universities are becoming more and more dependent upon

provincial governments for financial support, this danger of state control is increasing.

It is important to realize that the role of a modern university's academic staff is not at all like that of an industrial firm or a government department. Industrial workers and civil servants necessarily execute policies and pursue objectives which have been set for them by others — the stockholders and their board of directors, or the legislature and its executive. And their organization into an autocratic hierarchy of control, with all activities closely supervised, has been considered necessary in order to carry out these objectives with efficiency. But in a university, scholars must set their *own* objectives; each must be left free to pursue the truth according to his own light. As Dr. Capen has observed:

The university is and must be an institution without intellectual boundaries. It is and must be wholly free to prosecute the search for truth, unhampered by the possibility of a veto imposed from without or from above. Any aspect of nature, any work of man, any accepted idea, any entrenched prejudice, any institution of society, must be subject to evaluation by it, must be for it a fair field for new discovery. There must be no restraints upon the publication of its findings and interpretations, whether these happen to be popular or unpopular Those who pursue the truth under the sponsorship of the university cannot walk in jeopardy of their careers, should they chance to offend a board, or a board member, or an administrative official, or even an important segment of the general public. If such a condition is imposed upon them, the institution responsible therefor is not yet, or is no longer, a university.¹

Because our universities were organized before this need for scholarly independence was fully appreciated, a system of university government was created which assigned final control to an outside governing body and legally placed this body and the scholars in the relationship of master to servants — a relationship that is fundamentally wrong if the free search for truth is to flourish in Canada. This system, moreover, has resulted in a formal hierarchy of control in the internal administration of our universities that is essentially authoritarian. President, deans, directors, heads of departments and professors — all are appointed and directed from the top down in a system of superior-subordinate relationships, and the president has potentially arbitrary control over the promotion and pay of any faculty member. The effect

¹Samuel P. Capen (Chancellor Emeritus of the University of Buffalo). *The Management of Universities* (Buffalo, 1953), pp. 282, 10.

is to inhibit individual initiative, independence of mind and freedom of thought. Moreover, because of the limited time and attention that part-time lay members of governing boards can devote to university affairs, an excessive amount of power is concentrated in the hands of the permanent president.

It is true that over the years practices have been adopted and customs have developed which tend to soften the impact of this autocratic nature of our universities. But they also tend to disguise it. For example, internal bodies regulate and control many academic matters either independently of the governing board or only with its formal approval. Yet it is to be noted that most of these bodies — senate, council, board of deans, etc. — are made up primarily of administrative and academic officials appointed by the president and the governing board. Only rarely is there provision for the election of any significant proportion of these bodies by the faculty. Moreover, although the custom has developed in many institutions that academic staff of a certain rank are considered to have continuous or permanent tenure, the legal fact remains that faculty members hold their posts during pleasure and may be dismissed at any time without cause shown.² Hence the creation of the CAUT to protect the independence of scholars, its adoption of a statement on academic freedom, and its recommendation of regulations for adoption by individual universities prohibiting dismissal without adequate cause — all have been tremendous steps forward. But they do not alter the fact that our universities are not governed by the scholars themselves. Clearly, if academic freedom and independence are to be guaranteed in Canada, the basic nature of our university government must be changed: the scholars themselves must be given the predominant voice in governing their own university. In our opinion this requires that the academic staff should comprise the major element in the governing body. This can be best accomplished either by transferring the powers of the lay governing board to the academic senate and leaving the board with only advisory or residual powers, or by providing for a majority of academic members on the governing board.

Although the idea of a governing body containing members of faculty seems strange to many Canadians, such a system is actually in

²One of the few legal cases is *Craig v. the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto, Ontario*, 1923, in which it was held that custom or usage could not confer tenure, or inhibit the statutory authority of the board to dismiss at pleasure, 53 O.L.R. 312.

effect and working extremely well in most countries elsewhere in the Western world. A number of universities in the United States and Europe, and all of the universities in Australia and Britain have governing bodies with a large academic element; while the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge are entirely governed by scholars. And at most of the Roman Catholic universities in Canada, the governing body is mainly academic with laymen represented only on an advisory financial body such as that proposed above.

Our existing system of university government has been in effect for so long that our minds have become conditioned to it. As a result, people will invent all sorts of rationalizations to explain why the academic staff should not be members of the governing body. For example, we are so used to thinking of the faculty of a university as "employees" rather than as a community of scholars that many will argue immediately that such a scheme would not work because the faculty would be "hiring themselves". But bear in mind that only a few of the most capable faculty members would be members of the governing body. The president under the present scheme is in exactly this position. By virtue of his membership on the board he is in the same sense "hiring himself". Yet no one suggests that this is wrong. Similarly, often the managers of a business corporation are members of its board of directors and hence are "hiring themselves". If we think of the faculty as citizens of a university community rather than employees of a board, it will be at once apparent that it is possible for the governed to elect their own governors. This is, after all, the basis for our system of democratic government. Though for carrying on the essential teaching functions of the university it may be desirable to have the community of scholars organized into a very loose hierarchy, collectively they could maintain control by participating in the appointment of officials and by holding them accountable to a governing body chosen by the faculty.

The effect of barring the faculty from membership on governing boards has been to imply that they are incapable of assuming such responsibility. There are still people who will seriously argue that professors, not being men of affairs, are not capable of deciding on the direction in which a university should develop or on the complex problems of finance and construction that now face governing boards. Yet the modern university faculty includes specialists in almost every field of human activity, many of whom have a better understanding of

these problems than members of lay boards. The speciousness of the argument is revealed by the fact that, as Professor Percy Smith has pointed out,

our federal and provincial governments love to consult [professors] on the building of railways and dams, the formulation of national economic policies, the electoral system, the state of the arts, and in fact innumerable matters of national importance . . . university governments are deprived of the guidance of the very people whose advice national governments have learned to value. Surely to continue to assume, as in effect we do, that a varied group of the most highly-educated people in our society cannot govern by democratic processes the institution that they know best and care about most is to be simply hypocritical about either education or democracy — or both.³

In this connection, two eminent British observers of our system have made the following comments:

I should always like to think that anyone who was fit to teach my child Philosophy, or Political Science, (or Physics for that matter) was also fit to have one vote in the direction of what, after all, were largely his own affairs.⁴

No doubt the experience and wisdom of the teaching staff are informally drawn upon in the framing of policy, but that is not the same thing as giving to the teaching staff a direct voice in the affairs of an academic community of which they are members.⁵

Some — even among the academic community — will argue that professors should not be expected to be burdened with the type of responsibility assumed by a governing board. After all, its functions are primarily financial — concerned only with the “plumbing and maintenance” of the university. Yet a moment’s reflection will reveal that the line we try to draw between financial and academic matters is a myth accepted by boards and faculties alike to disguise the overriding power of the board and to prevent encroachments by the board upon internal academic affairs. As Professor Smith has pointed out, this distinction is nonsensical:

“Every significant financial decision is bound to affect the nature and functioning of the university; and it therefore becomes an academic decision. If it is decided that a hundred thousand dollars would be better spent on increasing the size of the football stadium than on

³J. Percy Smith, “University Government”, *C.A.U.T. Bulletin* (February, 1960), pp. 9-10.

⁴Charles H. Stewart (Secretary to the University of Edinburgh), “The Government of Canadian Universities”, *C.A.U.T. Bulletin* (April, 1957), p. 10.

⁵Sir James Mountford (Vice Chancellor of the University of Liverpool) “Report on Dr. J. F. Mountford’s Visit to Canada” (Mimeo., 1952), p. 4.

equipping a new laboratory or vice versa, that is inescapably an academic decision. If it is decided to appoint additional staff members or expand the work of one department rather than another, that is an academic decision.”⁶

The point is, surely, that if a university is to function at its best, and if its members are to be as free as possible from the threat of outside interference, faculty members must be able to determine the objectives and policies of the institution that they serve. For this reason they must be prepared to accept the responsibility of membership on the governing body and the sacrifice of time and energy that this entails.

Our thinking has been influenced so much by the hierarchical pattern of administration found in business and the civil service that many will argue that to place faculty members on the governing board would be undesirable because it would “short-circuit” the president and interfere with his effective control over his staff. Yet in the light of the need for academic freedom and independence, close control, far from being desirable, may actually be harmful. If a president were to find the presence of his “subordinates” on the board embarrassing in case they should disagree with him, then he would deserve to be embarrassed for regarding them as subordinates, and for not faithfully presenting to the board the faculty’s points of view. Moreover, being the only academic representative on a lay board, he cannot present these views adequately.

A related argument is that at some universities the governing board is for the most part quiescent and merely approves recommendations made to it by the president. To place faculty representatives on the board might reactivate it and cause it to interfere in academic affairs. In our opinion, however, substantial faculty representation would give the board a better appreciation of the faculty’s views and hence would nullify this potential danger. Moreover, this argument does not invalidate the case for a faculty majority. While it may be true that such self-denying boards exist, their legal powers remain strong and can be called into action at any time. And since the president is the only person in a position to make recommendations directly to the board, the effect of such self-denial is to transfer most of the board’s power to him.

A difficulty with governing boards composed of part-time lay members is that they are too large and meet too infrequently to be

⁶*Op. cit.*, p. 7.

an effective executive or planning body. Hence the executive power and the planning function fall entirely into the hands of the president and perhaps one or two purely administrative officials or influential members of the board. Executive power becomes too concentrated, and planning is either neglected or distorted by the particular views and interests of the few concerned. If responsible faculty members sat on an executive committee of the board (or senate, if power were transferred), they could share the executive power with the president, and could work with him to formulate plans for the most desirable development of the university. In this period of rapid university development it is essential that planning for the future be done and that it be done with a full knowledge of the nature and needs of the modern university.

We recognize that lay members are needed on the governing body to ensure that the university is aware of and responsive to the educational needs of modern society, and also to obtain the moral and financial support of the community. Lay members can bring special competence to the governing body, and can aid the faculty in interpreting the views of the general community to the university and, even more important, of the university to the community. In order to demonstrate unmistakably that a faculty-governed university neither fears nor disregards the general community, therefore, we support the principle of a lay element in the governing body and believe that men of the desired outlook would count it an honour to be invited by the faculty to assist in the government of such a university.

That lay members would bring a fresh view and community or financial support justifies the inclusion of *some* lay members on the governing body. But certainly it does not justify a board composed of all, or even a majority of, lay members. Competent scholars are as likely to be aware of the community's educational needs as most lay members of existing boards. And the traditional money-gathering function of lay boards has virtually disappeared due to the decline in the number of personal fortunes, the rise of systematic corporate giving, the hiring of university "development officers" and the great increase in government support. Moreover, besides reconstituting an existing lay board of governors as an advisory body, the needs and interests of the outside community can be made known to the university, and support by influential persons can be obtained, in a wide variety of other ways. For example, most academic senates have lay members,

and many universities make extensive use of advisory councils — a device that could easily be extended should either of our proposals be adopted. Hence, in our opinion the argument that a mainly academic governing body would not be responsive enough to the interests of the general community is untenable. The university is too dependent upon the public for financial support for this to be a real danger.

Indeed, the danger has always been the reverse: segments of the community trying, through the offer of financial support, to shape the development of the university to their particular interests. And there is no doubt that provincial governments, through their control over the governing legislation and their growing financial support, will hold the whiphand in university development, regardless of the nature of the governing body. To develop in accordance with the general and long-term public interest, a university may have to oppose undesirable political pressures from the particular party in power which, after all, may have only a small or temporary majority in the legislature. It must guard against political interference designed to satisfy particular interests at the expense of the general interest. And an independent, mainly academic governing body is more likely to be able to do this than one that may have members with political or special interests in the outside community. In addition, however, financial support must be so arranged as to reduce this possibility of outside interference or direct control.

Your committee are therefore of the opinion that our university community and indeed the general community should accept nothing less as their goal than the reform of our university governments so as to make them highly independent and self-governing, with the academic staff having the predominant voice in all matters of policy and administration. To facilitate the achievement of this goal, we have set forth below, under nine headings, a brief statement of desirable principles of university government. We then discuss in greater detail the merits of particular arrangements or practices designed to implement or at least approach these objectives.

We should like to acknowledge the great help we have received from the various reports of Committee T of the American Association of University Professors, beginning with the basic report and statement of principles in 1920, which have had a tremendous impact upon university government in the United States. Our statement of principles and discussion of practices are in part derived from the similar

statement and discussion contained in the 1937 and 1955 reports of Committee T (AAUP *Bulletin*, Feb., 1938, and Spring, 1955). These reports are based on years of study of and experience with schemes for greater faculty participation in American university government. In our opinion, however, the objectives of Committee T and of the AAUP have never been far-reaching enough. While the gains in faculty participation since 1920 have been impressive, generally the basic structure of university government in the United States has remained unchanged.⁷

We wish to stress that in presenting these proposals for reform we do so in no spirit of animus against university officials or members of governing boards as individuals, and not primarily on the ground of improving faculty status, but because we believe that the present system unwittingly militates against the free search for truth and the free expression of thought. The effect of the system we propose should be to improve teaching, scholarship, research, and indeed the whole intellectual life of our country. Freedom of thought is essential to a healthy democracy. As the proportion of our population employed by governments and large corporations grows, however, there develop larger and larger areas of activity in which people are unable to express criticism without giving offence or putting their livelihood in jeopardy. Hence, freedom of thought and expression for scholars must be not only permitted but actively encouraged if we are to solve the great material, intellectual and moral problems of our time.

⁷The chief area of progress in the United States has been faculty consultation in the choice of president and deans. The faculty were consulted in the choice of president and deans in about one-quarter of 228 institutions surveyed in 1939 and in about half of 326 surveyed in 1955. This is revealed in the following tabulation, compiled by the chairman of our committee from the 1955 report of Committee T, which shows the extent of faculty participation in various categories, for the institutions surveyed, and the progress made since 1939:

	%1939	%1955
1. Have Plan for Exchange of Opinion With Board (faculty on board, joint committees, etc)	23	25
2. Faculty Consulted in Choice of a New President	26	48
3. Consulted in Choice of Deans (including informally)	30	54
4. Consulted in Appointments, Promotions and Dismissals (other than through dept. heads; e.g., committee)	23	34
5. Consulted in Making Budget (other than through dept. heads; e.g., committee)	15	15
6. General Faculty Has Legislative Powers	79	83
7. General Faculty Elects at Least One of its Committees	55	62
8. Department Heads Chosen by Formal Consultation, Election, Rotation, or from Elected Panel	29	31

2. Desirable Principles

In order to promote the free search for truth, the free expression of thought and the principles of democratic government in our society, universities should enjoy as high a degree of independence and self-government as possible. To achieve these objectives the following principles are considered desirable:

I. *Financial Independence.* Financial support to universities should be given with no attempt at interference or direct control.

11. *The Governing Body.* Members of the academic staff should constitute a majority of the governing body. Either the powers of the lay governing board should be transferred to the academic senate, and the board reconstituted as a board of trustees with advisory functions or residual powers of raising and investing money; or the governing board should contain a majority of academic members, at least half of whom should be directly elected by the faculty. If the board's powers are transferred, lay members appointed by the faculty should be included on the senate and/or its executive committee.

III. *Ultimate Powers of Faculties.* The faculty of the university at large or its authorized representatives, and the faculty of each college, school or division should have ultimate legislative power over educational policies within the jurisdiction of that faculty, and should control its own organization and committees.

IV. *Composition of Senates.* Senates should be composed mainly of academic members, at least half of whom should be directly elected.

V. *Offices of President and Dean.* The president and deans should hold office for a limited period, preferably not exceeding six years, and should not be eligible for immediate reappointment. The general faculty should participate in nominating and appointing a president, and the faculty of a college, school or division should elect, or participate in selecting, its dean.

VI. *Limits on Powers of Administrative Officers.* Administrative officers should be required to consult, and should normally take the advice of, representative faculty bodies in matters of educational policy, and specifically in appointments, promotions and dismissals, and in making budgets.

VII. *Collective Authority of Departments.* The departments of instruction, however organized, should be consultative bodies and should

exercise what is in effect a collective authority over the teaching arrangements under their jurisdiction. In appointing departmental chairmen, administrative officers should be required to consult formally, and should normally take the advice of, the members of a department, and should encourage the regular rotation of departmental chairmen in those departments that wish it. The appointment of chairmen should be for a period of from three to six years, with eligibility for reappointment on the recommendation of the members of a department.

VIII. *Role of the Faculty Association.* The duly elected representatives of the faculty association should be freely encouraged to present their views to the president, and in person to the governing body if they so desire, on matters of staff welfare and, especially where no other appropriate faculty body exists, on any other matter affecting the welfare of the university.

IX. *Formality of Arrangements.* Arrangements to implement the principles set forth above should be made formal and definite by specific adoption, either in the legislation governing the university or in the by-laws of its governing bodies.

Even in institutions which have moved a long way toward internally democratic practices, there has been a tendency to rest upon unwritten and consequently indefinite arrangements for faculty consultation and participation. This unfortunately lends support to the presumption that consultation is an act of administrative grace, and may leave the principles in a precarious state with a change of administrative personnel.

3. Application of the Principles

It is the intention in this part of the report to give additional supporting arguments for the principles set forth above, and to propose and discuss the detailed arrangements that might most effectively implement these principles. Since it is not to be expected that the principles will be fully implemented immediately, we also propose schemes that represent steps toward implementing them. Most of these are based on our study of university government in Canada and on the reports of Committee T, and can be reported as successfully operating at one or more universities in Canada and at many in the United States.

1) *Financial Independence*. A factor clearly affecting the government and independence of universities is the nature of financial support. It is generally acknowledged that financial support carries with it the danger of undesirable influence and the potential danger of control. For this reason it is desirable that financial support for universities should come from a variety of sources. A decade or more ago this situation actually obtained in Canada, with income about evenly distributed among endowments or private gifts, student fees and government grants. Now, however, only about 15% of university income comes from private sources, about 25% from student fees, and the remaining 60% from government. There seems every likelihood that this dependence upon government support will increase. An eminent observer of this long-term shift to state support in Commonwealth and American universities has expressed the problem this way:

there is a chance that by yielding to more and more government pressures the ideal of university integrity might be destroyed by attrition and higher education relegated to the position of a function of government like highways, health or defense. However remote such a possibility, it suggests the wisdom of an earnest consideration of the means of safeguarding the autonomy of universities in the critical period ahead, when the adjustment is being made to the change in the source of support of colleges and universities.⁸

So long as our universities are receiving grants from both the provincial and federal levels of government, this dependence upon government grants may constitute no serious danger since no single source of income is preponderant. It is probable, however, that some of our provincial universities, as a result of their greater dependence upon provincial revenues and their closer connection with provincial governments, have already suffered some distortion of their development as a result of government influence. Moreover, in our opinion the new scheme of university finance offered by the federal government to the provinces constitutes a serious danger to the independence of the universities. For by this scheme any province that chose to adopt the option of collecting an additional one percent of the corporation tax would thereby gain control over the distribution of the existing federal grants and any future increase in those grants. Hence the provincial government would be controlling the lion's share of the income of the universities in that province. For this reason we feel

⁸Oliver C. Carmichael (Former President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), *Universities: Commonwealth and American* (New York, 1959), p. 324.

that action should be taken to prevent this scheme coming into effect in provinces other than Quebec. Action should also be taken to ensure that provincial grants will be distributed in a manner such that there will be no hint or possibility of political interference in university affairs. This might be accomplished by the creation of provincial university grants commissions like the one in Britain, the distribution of grants by an acceptable, objective formula, and statutory appropriations reviewed, say, every five years. The federal and relevant provincial governments should also be urged to make further provisions in the estate and corporation tax arrangements to encourage individuals and private corporations to provide much larger endowments and gifts for universities, thus increasing their total income from private sources.

2) *The Governing Body*. We recognize that the objective of a predominant voice for the faculty might be achieved in ways other than by providing for a faculty majority on the governing body. For example, most members of the governing board might be chosen by but not necessarily from the faculty. Here the objective would be to choose the best persons available, whether faculty or lay. This plan, while preserving the principle of ultimate faculty control, would have the advantage of avoiding a clear distinction between faculty and lay members and the consequent stress upon majorities and minorities: members of the board would be expected to pursue the best interests of the university without regard to whether they were faculty or lay members. It would also have the advantages of flexibility and gradualism: a faculty could at first name mainly lay members, or laymen plus eminent scholars from another university, and gradually increase the number from its own faculty as this procedure demonstrated its worth. Such a plan, however, has its own problems, such as how to choose the outside persons and how to find enough who are of the right quality and at the same time can devote the necessary time and energy to the task. Although these problems may not be insurmountable, the majority of our committee preferred to state directly that the faculty ought to be predominant on the governing body.

Of the two alternatives that we have presented — transferring the powers of the governing board to the senate, or reforming the composition of the board — the first is recommended as preferable. Although in a sense more drastic, it is the simplest and most straightforward way of ensuring a university governed mainly by the scholars themselves. A predominantly academic board would overlap the senate

and probably make the one or the other body unnecessary, or the board would become, in effect, an executive committee of the senate. Moreover, proposing a faculty majority on an existing board invites compromise and is likely to result in half-measures such as faculty nomination or selection of only a few lay or academic members of the board. While a great improvement over the present situation, such schemes would not ensure a predominant voice for the faculty and hence would not alter the master-servant relationship. There is no reason, however, why both objectives should not be pursued at once, with the initial steps being the transfer of as many powers as possible to the senate and the placing of some faculty representatives on the governing board.

If the board's powers are to be taken over by the senate, then the senate should have a small executive committee capable of exercising these powers. This committee should be composed of not only academic officials but also members elected by the faculty to the senate. And for reasons already given, it is important that laymen should be included on the senate and/or its executive committee. To avoid any danger of outside interference, however, they should be appointed by the senate itself.

Whichever alternative is chosen, the chief problem regarding faculty representation on the board and/or senate will be the method of choosing representatives. A faculty offered such an opportunity will have to work on this problem carefully, since it might work against the future success of the principles if in the first instance or two of their application those chosen did not fairly represent the faculty. In a small institution this might require only a simple write-in ballot or nomination and vote, while in a large university more elaborate arrangements will be needed to represent the faculties of each constituent part. Terms of office should be relatively short, perhaps with eligibility for re-election at least once, and members should probably retire in rotation. Since the most desirable method would vary for each institution, we make no more detailed proposals. At the same time, we feel that it would demonstrate a lack of faith in democratic processes were a faculty to take the easy way out by proposing or agreeing that senior administrative and academic officials should serve on the board and/or senate, in an *ex officio* capacity, as the faculty's sole representatives.

If the governing board is to be retained, but with a majority of academic members, to work effectively it should be relatively small. If, however, it is considered necessary to have a large board in order to include a considerable number from graduates and the outside community, then it should have a strong executive committee for planning policy. To provide an opportunity for judgement on the continuing value of the contribution made by any member appointed from outside the university, without embarrassment to him, such an appointment should be for a definite term with eligibility for reappointment only after the lapse of a stated time (say, one year). At the provincial universities, to remove the possibility of government interference, the faculty, the graduates or the board itself should appoint any members from outside the university. If it is desired that the government should demonstrate its ultimate legal control, the government's formal approval of faculty and other appointments could be required, or the government could appoint from a panel nominated by the faculty, graduates or board. A scheme such as this has been proposed recently at the University of Manitoba.⁹ To further ensure against outside control or interference, the board itself, subject to faculty participation, should appoint the president, he should be its chairman, and his approval should be required for all appointments, promotions and dismissals. If he is not to be chairman, the board should name its own chairman.

Where neither the principle of transferring the board's powers to the senate nor placing on the board a majority of academic members is accepted, the powers of the board ought at least to be drastically reduced. In particular, the ultimate power of boards over academic matters should be removed. In the governing legislation the general faculty or its representative body should be given the final authority over all internal academic matters such as curricula, courses, degrees, including honorary degrees, standards for admission and for degrees, student government and discipline, numbers of teaching hours, and individual appointments and promotions up to the level of president. The provincial universities in Western Canada already have such a division of powers in their governing legislation. In addition it should be specified that the board may not act on *any* matter of policy without having first received the recommendation or approval of the general

⁹It also involves the election of half the board by, but not necessarily from, the faculty. At Saskatchewan, the faculty association has recently proposed the election of half the board by and from the faculty.

faculty or its representative body. In this way, even though it may be felt that ultimate *de jure* power over academic matters involving finance should remain with the board, the faculty can be given nearly ultimate *de facto* power over these matters. To make clear this changed status of the board, it should be called a board of trustees.

Even where the governing legislation is not changed, and a board retains its traditional powers, it should make no general policy decisions without first having received the advice of the relevant academic body, and should ordinarily accept that advice. In other words, though having the ultimate power to reject, the board should voluntarily place itself in the position of not ordinarily initiating policy decisions. As Sir Eric Ashby has so convincingly demonstrated, university business should always flow upward, never downward.¹⁰ Also, there ought to be a close understanding between the board and the faculty, and to this end agencies other than the president are required for joint conference between the two bodies. Experience in Canada and the United States has shown that among the most successful of these are a joint conference or planning committee of board and faculty which meets regularly, or on call, to discuss university problems, and joint standing committees on particular subjects. Several universities in Canada and at least 55 in the United States have such schemes. To reduce the burden on the president of providing detailed information to the board as well as to increase the flow of information between faculty and board, some academic official, such as secretary of the faculty or senate, a dean or registrar, should serve as secretary of the board. Also, elected faculty representatives or academic officials should be invited to attend meetings of the board.

The utility of any of these arrangements, however, depends upon the spirit in which they are made. There will be little value in faculty members attending board meetings, for example, if decisions are really made by an executive or finance committee and only presented to the board for ratification. In such a case it would be far more helpful if faculty members sat on the executive or finance committee instead.

The board should also produce consolidations of its by-laws and of its regulations regarding staff welfare, should make known that its minutes are open to inspection by members of the faculty, and to this end should provide a copy of its minutes to the secretary of the faculty or senate.

¹⁰Sir Eric Ashby (Vice-Chancellor, the Queen's University of Belfast), *Technology and the Academics* (London, 1958), pp. 98-109.

3) *Ultimate Powers of Faculties.* If the scholars themselves governed our universities, there would no longer be any need for perpetuating the artificial distinction between financial and educational policies. A faculty would have jurisdiction over *all* educational policies and it would only remain to spell out this fact in the governing legislation by making the faculty the members of the university corporation and by indicating that the governing body is only acting as their agent.

A factor working against the principle of a faculty's "ultimate legislative power", however, is that in most universities in Canada the senate — a body of laymen and officials not directly representative of the faculty — is the one that has been given formal academic powers. Where a university is very large, with many constituent units and with faculty members numbering in the hundreds, the meeting of the faculty as a legislative body may be impractical. In that case, a senate, as the legislative body representing the faculty, may be necessary. But in most universities in Canada this is not the case, and the whole faculty could perfectly well meet as the legislative body — as attested to by the successful operation of some very large bodies of this kind in both Canada and the United States. In most universities, therefore, the governing legislation should give the legislative power directly to the general faculty which should meet as a legislative body.

A related problem is that in most universities the general faculty (and in our largest universities even the senate) is too large to constitute an adequate body for the framing of policies. Hence, like a legislature, it can expect to do no more than ratify, criticize or oppose proposals presented to it. If it is to be effective in framing policies, it must have standing and special committees, and these committees must be clearly under the control of the general faculty. In many universities committees of the faculty are named and chaired by administrative officers. Although this is convenient, both for administrative officers and faculty, it may result in a tight administrative control over all proposals made to the faculty. It is perhaps too much to expect that a general faculty meeting should take the time and trouble to elect all of its committees. But it should elect at least its most important ones. A very effective device used at a number of institutions is to have the general faculty elect a single key committee to study committee organization and, after consulting the wishes and interests of faculty members, to name the chairmen and members of committees. If it is felt that the president should exert some

influence over faculty committees, it can be provided that he should name the chairman of this committee from among those elected. To ensure responsiveness and continuity, the members of this and all other standing committees should serve for limited, non-renewable terms of from three to six years, and their terms should overlap.

For a number of reasons committees should be small — in most cases having no more than five members. The most important reason, obviously, is to save the time of faculty members. Not only does a reduction in size reduce the number of persons required, but it also reduces the number of hours devoted to irrelevant discussion — as anyone who has served on a large committee knows. A not so obvious but important reason is that a small committee increases the feeling of responsibility of each member. Members of a committee of three are much more likely to work hard on problems than members of a committee of five, who, except for the chairman, may all feel a strange compulsion to “let George do it”. In fact, there is much to be said for “one-man” committees to report on problems, provided they have been democratically appointed.

4) *Composition of Senates.* The reasons for proposing that a senate, if required at all, should be a body representative of the faculty have already been made clear. If it is to be adequately representative, at least half of its members should be directly elected by the general faculty or, in a large university, the faculties of the constituent units. At several universities in Canada the senate is very large and includes numerous members from outside the university, in some cases even a majority. Where this is so, a portion of the outside members should be removed and constituted as a separate advisory council meeting either separately or, periodically, with the senate. If that were done, the senate would then be able to meet more frequently and would become small enough to be an effective legislative body.

5) *Offices of President and Dean.* In North America we are so struck with the “great man” theory of administration we forget that in a highly educated community such as a university there are many persons who can fill the chief administrative offices successfully. In Britain it is different: there it is common for deans and even vice-chancellors to be elected for short terms. And at the Roman Catholic universities in Canada it is the rule that rectors hold office for only six years. As a result, the degree of arbitrary power in these offices is not nearly so dangerously great. We believe that no single change

would reduce the inordinate power of presidents and deans more quickly or effectively than to require them to serve a limited term of office which is not immediately renewable. Although this term should be long enough for a man to give whatever he can that is fresh or significant, the fact that it is limited — in particular a man's knowledge that on his staff there are persons under whom he may in future be serving — would prevent his developing an arbitrary attitude. This device, combined with faculty participation in selection, would reduce the "great man" aura now surrounding these offices. We also suggest that academic officers should be paid no more, or very little more, than professors.¹¹

While we propose six years as the maximum initial term of office, we recognize that this figure is arbitrary. It would have the advantage of being short enough that a man would not be so long away from his specialty that, after a sabbatical leave, he could not return to it. Former President Thompson, however, has suggested ten years as the ideal term for a president.¹²

Where the proposal that a president or deans should not be eligible for reappointment is not accepted, at least arrangements should be made for formal consultation with the faculty before their reappointment. However, their reappointment would be virtually automatic unless they were made ineligible for reappointment immediately. They could, however, be made eligible for reappointment after the lapse of a minimum period of time — say, one or two years — so that the most successful could be called into service again; and they would, of course, be eligible for appointment elsewhere.

Among the several ways in which faculties may participate in the selection of a president, those representing the highest degree of participation, short of direct election, are the election of faculty members to sit with board members on the committee of selection, and the selection of individual faculty members by the board to advise

¹¹On this point a member of our committee has this to say: "If president and deans are to become, as I agree they must, elected officers who will be *primi inter pares*, it is of the first and practical importance that they should not have extra pay while discharging administrative duties. Not only are the higher salaries now paid these officers an affront to scholarship, they make it difficult for a scholar to decline, or to cease to be, an administrator. They should be freed from teaching duties and research, to the degree their duties may require, and they should be given expense and entertainment funds; nothing more."

¹²W. P. Thompson (formerly President, University of Saskatchewan), "The Job of a University President", *Queen's Quarterly* (Winter, 1956), p. 576.

its committee of selection. Over 100 universities in the United States now use one or other of these devices. Similarly, short of direct election of deans, ways in which faculty participation may be assured are to require the president to appoint a selection committee which includes faculty members or to require him to consult all departmental chairmen before making an appointment. Over 70 universities in the United States make use of one or other of these arrangements. A similar device, which still leaves the final choice in the hands of the president, is a secret write-in ballot from the faculty or from departmental chairmen, the results of which are made known only to the president.

6) *Limits on Powers of Administrative Officers.* Merely to announce a policy decision to the full faculty or senate for possible comment is not consultation. Administrative officers should be *required* by the governing regulations to seek the advice of a faculty body on all major matters of educational policy *before* decisions are made. Such matters include the following: the creation of new departments, schools, administrative units, curricula or courses, the construction of new buildings, the abolition of any educational or research activity, the distribution of income between material equipment and personnel, determination of the proper ratio between numbers of students and instructors, numbers of teaching hours, standards for admission and for degrees, the promotion of research, and provision for publication.

Principle VI, in stating that administrative officers should *normally* accept the advice of faculty bodies, recognizes that there may be occasions when this advice, because it represents a particular interest as opposed to the general interest of the university, must be overridden. Yet this is no reason why every effort should not be made to seek advice. Moreover, to ensure that an administrative officer is not merely substituting his own private judgement for that of the body from whom he received advice, he should seek enough advice elsewhere to assure himself that his view is supported by the general opinion of the university community. "The completely democratic procedure in educational matters may be very slow and at times exasperating", says Dr. Thompson, "particularly when a proposal encounters the usual professorial conservatism or vested interests. It may result in mistakes which would be avoided if decisions were made by able administrators. But its benefits greatly outweigh its disadvantages."¹³

¹³Thompson, *ibid.*, p. 570.

The president and other administrative officers need not be regarded as power-hungry autocrats to explain why so much decision-making power falls into their hands. One of the chief reasons is that, even if they are willing to share administrative power with the faculty, it is difficult to create bodies adequately representative of the faculty and at the same time capable of working with the administrative officers in the planning of over-all policies. The general faculty and even the senate are usually too large and unwieldy for this purpose. Often senates are also unsuitable because they contain so many representatives from outside the university. The outside representatives necessitate infrequent meetings and make it impossible for the senate to meet when problems arise, or else to consider them in any detail. A president, like a prime minister, should have a small cabinet with which he can share policy-making and administrative power. Rather than being *the* chief executive — which is, after all, an American concept of the executive office — he should be *primus inter pares*. For this purpose the best arrangement appears to be a small administrative council containing the senior academic officers *ex officio* and an equal number of elected representatives of the faculty. Similarly, a faculty committee could be elected to work in an executive capacity with a dean.

On the conditions necessary for the success of such councils or committees, Committee T had this to say:

The fact should be emphasized that an executive committee of this sort, dealing with all the more important administrative problems of a college, can not possibly be effective unless the chosen representatives of the faculty are prepared to devote much time and much self-sacrificing labor to the work. No effective influence can be exerted except by a committee whose members are continuously in touch with the problems to be solved and hence are capable of first-hand judgments on their merits. Without this, a committee becomes merely a registering device for the decisions of a [president or] dean who is better informed than the committeemen. No member of a faculty is justified in accepting such a position unless he sees his way clear to the necessary expenditure of time, and no plan can be effective unless it secures members prepared to accept the full responsibility.¹⁴

If the objective of faculty control over academic policies is to be achieved, faculty members must accept this responsibility. Fortunately, the device of limited terms of office would ensure that their sacrifice of time on scholarly work would be for only a limited period.

¹⁴AAUP *Bulletin* (Feb., 1938), p. 145.

The making of budgets, a matter closely related to the formation of overall policies, is a field where faculty consultation is most consistently ignored. It is common for presidents and deans to consult chairmen on departmental needs. But, again probably because of the lack of a suitable faculty body, the faculty are rarely consulted on over-all budget matters. It is suggested that the administrative council proposed above might serve this purpose. A number of universities in the United States have a council or committee such as this to review the over-all budget.

Regarding appointments and promotions, practices are generally good in Canada, with the chairman of a department either making a recommendation or being consulted, but it should be observed that these practices are only informal, exist as acts of administrative grace, are sometimes ignored, and that usually there exist neither regulations requiring consultation nor formal machinery to ensure it. Provided these practices are formalized and arrangements are made to ensure that departmental chairmen consult with the other members of their departments when appropriate, there seems no reason why they should not continue. However, we feel that the approval of faculty committees on appointment and promotion before a final choice is made would be desirable, and that there may be a need for a joint faculty-administration committee on over-all appointment and promotion policies in order to ensure equity among departments, schools and divisions. Such committees exist in more than a hundred universities in the United States and Canada, including California, Columbia, Harvard, M.I.T., Michigan, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Stanford, Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan. "Wherever provision for consultation of this type is made," says Dean Armstrong, "the deans concerned were most enthusiastic in their comments . . . and its successful use by the western universities is a model for the others. The value of judgment by one's academic peers need not be emphasized."¹⁵

Regarding tenure and dismissal, since a CAUT committee has already proposed desirable regulations, which we support, we make no further comment except to say that the maximum period of probation should be made to include any period of temporary appointment. Otherwise, an institution could continue a person indefinitely on a series of one-year temporary appointments. Most of us also feel that

¹⁵H. S. Armstrong (Dean of Arts and Science, McMaster University), *Academic Administration in Higher Education* (Canadian Universities Foundation, mimeo., 1959), p. 92.

three years is long enough for an institution to make up its mind about a person and that therefore the maximum period should be reduced wherever possible from five to three years.

7) *Collective Authority of Departments.* We believe that the objective of ensuring full consultation and harmony within a department would be best achieved by a limited term of office and a regular rotation of the chairmanship among all members of professorial rank. The present practice of appointing permanent heads of departments tends to overemphasize the importance of the administrative function and to give these heads an amount of prestige and power that weakens the independence of faculty members. In our opinion, moreover, the terms "head" (of a department) and "director" (of a school or division) smack of undue influence, and "chairman" is to be preferred. It is true that strong departmental heads may be needed, as a sort of counterbalance, where the powers of deans and president are too great. But if our proposals regarding the latter are adopted, this argument will no longer hold true.

Despite his best intentions, a chairman who has been in office for too long tends more and more to make decisions by himself and to neglect, if not ignore, the views of other members of his department. Even where appointment is for a fixed term, reappointment becomes automatic and tenure in effect continuous unless there is specific provision for rotation. Sometimes the argument is used that a chairman who holds office for a short period and may be a relatively junior member of staff will not represent the interests of his department as strongly as he should. But this argument ignores the fact that senior members of the department can and do exert their influence through other channels. In any case, the argument falls down if the rotation system is in effect in all or nearly all departments, for in the long run each department will exert a relatively equal influence.

We recognize, however, that in particular departments, especially in small institutions, circumstances may be such that rotation would not be feasible. The members of a department may be quite happy with their chairman and, because of his eminence and seniority or administrative interest and ability, may not wish the chairmanship to rotate. In such cases, provided they are consulted periodically to make *sure* that they are satisfied, there is no reason why such an arrangement should not continue. But a fixed term of office is desirable in order to provide an opportunity at the time of proposed reappointment for

formal consultation on this matter. In large universities, if consultation with all members of a department is to be assured, this consultation should probably take the form of a ballot.

We suggest a term of more than two years in order to give the chairman time to learn his job and make a fresh contribution, and of not more than six in order to provide an opportunity for adequate rotation, or, in departments where rotation is not in effect, for the administration to replace a chairman who is unsatisfactory to the department or who wishes to retire to full-time academic work. Institutions that appoint chairmen with continuous tenure, or for limited terms but where reappointment is customary, find it difficult to remove an unsatisfactory chairman, and a chairman who may wish to retire may be pressed, or at least will feel an obligation, not to resign. We therefore feel that a mixed system within the same institution, of rotation in some departments and fixed terms with opportunity for reappointment in others, is highly desirable because the retirement of departmental chairmen is then not regarded as such a world-shaking event as it now is in most institutions. An unsatisfactory chairman can then be retired without loss of face and others can retire to scholarly work without being made to feel that they have deserted the ship. A full or mixed rotation system is already successfully in effect in a considerable number of universities in the United States and Canada, including Harvard, Princeton, Michigan, Chicago, Northwestern, California (Berkeley) and Carleton Universities.¹⁶

Where rotation is not adopted, schemes that we should like to recommend for large universities and departments are either the election of departmental chairmen by formal ballot, formal consultation involving a ballot before appointment, or appointment from a panel drawn up by members of a department. One or other of these schemes is used in about 70 large universities in the United States.

It remains only to note that conceiving of departments as consultative bodies does not imply that the chairman must hold a departmental meeting every day or should consult the other members of his department every time he turns around. In most cases he will know the mind of the other members and can safely make decisions on small matters without bothering them. It is only when he is in any doubt about their

¹⁶See Armstrong, *ibid.*, who says, "The rotation of the office ensures that the responsibilities will not fall indefinitely on the one man, often the most able researcher or teacher, to the detriment of his own work." Pp. 10, 11.

probable views on important issues that he would need to seek their approval. A chairman of a small department who is in frequent touch informally with other departmental members may find that formal meetings are unnecessary, or that two formal meetings a year — one in the early fall and one at budget time — are enough to clear up all important matters that arise. In large departments, however, unless regular formal meetings are held, because of the time involved in consultation, a chairman is tempted to make unwarranted assumptions about other people's probable views and either to neglect consultation on a particular matter or not to consult all who should be consulted. Moreover, a formal meeting provides a *specific occasion* for other members of the department to raise issues that might otherwise remain unmentioned.

8) *Role of the Faculty Association.* Many of the problems with which faculty associations now find themselves compelled to deal, would, of course, not arise, or would be dealt with by other academic bodies, should the scheme for university reform that we have presented be adopted. Since it is not likely that this scheme will be fully implemented for some time, meanwhile the local faculty association and its committees must be prepared to deal with a wide range of academic matters that are not now being adequately handled by the regular faculty bodies. In particular, they must be prepared to recommend measures for the reform of their university's government.

4. The Achievement of Reform

The far-reaching scheme of university reform proposed here will be achieved neither quickly nor easily. However, since we know that in the main our case is sound, if we argue it temperately and persuasively we can expect reasonable men — in university administration, on boards of governors, in government and elsewhere — to support it. Hence far more will be achieved by boldly insisting that the basic structure be changed than by timidly requesting small gains in internal faculty participation and regarding each of these as a major victory. In the United States the AAUP has been chipping away at small gains for over forty years without having yet made a significant hole in the structure.

The point is that the system can be much more easily and effectively changed from the top — provided there is a willingness to bring about change. This means, however, that not only university

officials but also board members, and, in the case of sectarian and provincial universities, church officials and members of the legislature, and ultimately the general public must be persuaded that change is desirable. For in most cases a basic change will require a change in the governing legislation. We must therefore take our case beyond the walls of the university. We must write and speak publicly, vigorously and frequently on this matter. And so that the present form of university government will not become too sanctified by tradition, we must act soon. Canadians are still a vigorous, inventive people, not bound by irrational tradition. They are still willing to experiment with new institutional forms. Hence there is reason to expect that, if we act soon, community support will be forthcoming.

Members of the Committee: D. C. Rowat, Political Science, Carleton (Chairman); D. G. Anglin, Political Science, Carleton; R. H. Common, Agricultural Chemistry, McGill; W. S. MacNutt, History, New Brunswick; W. L. Morton, History, Manitoba.

STAFFING CANADIAN SUMMER SCHOOLS

Directors of Canadian summer schools are finding increasing difficulty in getting staff to do summer teaching. It is not surprising that this should be so. Though summer school salaries in Canada have generally risen of late years, the rises have been slow and the salaries remain small. Moreover Canadian and American methods of payment for summer school differ markedly, and the difference is much to Canada's disadvantage. It is important to grasp this fact, because the border is so easily crossed and Canadian summer schools so often seek staff from the south side of it.

The commonest Canadian practice is to pay all summer school teachers the same sum, regardless of their rank and experience. At the time of writing no Canadian university is paying more than \$1,000.00 for summer school teaching, and many not only pay less, but much less (though it is usual to pay at least a part of the travelling expenses of visiting instructors).^{*} The contrast between this and U.S. summer school salary policies, as shown by the samples listed in the following chart, is most interesting.

^{*}But the writer knows of only one university which has been willing to pay the steamship expenses of European instructors, though he hopes there are more.

U.S. SUMMER SCHOOL SYSTEMS

UNIVERSITY	SALARY	TEACHING LOAD
Alabama	1/6 of annual salary, the Associate Professor's "floor" being \$11,000.00.	5 weeks for a total of 88 hours all told.
Colorado	Up to \$2,500.00.	10 weeks at 7-9 hours per week
Duke	1/6 of annual salary, which = \$1,200.00 to \$1,500.00 for an Associate teaching summer school.	5 weeks for a total of 88 hours all told.
El Camino Junior College, Los Angeles county, California	1½ months' salary, at the rate of salary payable in the coming year. (A Ph.D. with 3 years' teaching experience said to receive \$1,300.00)	6 weeks at 6 hours per week.
Harvard	Up to \$2,200.00.	8 weeks at 10 hours per week.
Illinois	1/6 of annual salary.	8 weeks at 10 hours per week.
Indiana	17% of annual salary	8 weeks at 10 hours per week.
Minnesota	Up to \$1,500.00.	Offers 2 separate sessions, each of 5 weeks at 10 hours per week; staff teaching in one session are ineligible to teach in the other.
North Western	From \$1,000.00 to \$1,500.00.	8 weeks at 8 hours per week.
Oklahoma	95% per month of regular monthly salary paid during the academic year.	8 weeks at 15 hours per week.
Pittsburg	1/35 of annual salary paid for each week of summer school teaching.	A maximum of 5 hours per week.
Rutgers	15% of annual salary.	6 weeks at 10 hours per week.
Syracuse	Up to \$1,500.00.	Up to 6 weeks for a total of 120 hours at most.
U.C.L.A.	1½ months' salary, at the rate of salary payable in the coming year.	8 weeks at 8 hours per week.
Wayne State	Up to \$1,600.00.	8 weeks at 8 hours per week.
Western Reserve	\$1,200.00 for Professor. \$1,000.00 for Associate Professor \$800.00 for Assistant Professor	Offers two separate summer school sessions, each of 6 weeks at 6 hours per week.

On this chart the following things are to be said. First, it was compiled at random from information given by old friends and acquaintances met at the gathering of an American learned society in 1959. Its sixteen colleges still represent north and south, the east and the far west. No attempt was made to pick specially wealthy colleges (*e.g.*, the absence from the list of such places as Yale, Princeton and Berkeley is conspicuous); and no institution about which the writer received information at that gathering has been omitted. No doubt it would be possible to find some U.S. colleges which pay less than any here named. That point, however, is scarcely important, for, in a country with so many universities of such widely varying quality as the U.S.A., it would not be hard to compile a list of colleges where both pay and academic standards were dismally low. But one hopes these are not the places from which self-respecting Canadian universities would wish to hire instructors for summer teaching or with which they would choose to be compared.

Secondly, it must be acknowledged some of the information received may be wrong, simply because it was given by word of mouth and men's memories may err. Such individual slips, however, are not likely to be numerous or to have much effect on the general picture. A far more probable cause of error lies in the facts that this information was culled in 1959 and that new scales of payment may well be in use by the date that these words are printed. But any change in that direction is almost certain to be upwards, and hence will not make things easier for heads of Canadian summer schools in search of staffs.

Points that emerge from the chart are, first, the fact that American colleges, unlike nearly all Canadian colleges, take the rational view that if a man of experience and proven ability is worth more than a youngster during the regular winter terms, he is also worth more than a youngster in summer school. Hence summer school pay is graduated according to rank. Secondly, the teaching load in these American summer schools is only occasionally much greater than that which is demanded in Canada, and sometimes it is very much less (note particularly El Camino Junior College, the University of Minnesota and Western Reserve). Thirdly, it will be noticed that 1/6 of the annual salary, or thereabouts, is a common rate for summer school. This means that any lecturer or assistant professor in the U.S.A., whose annual salary exceeds the modest total of some

\$6,000.00, will do better if he stays at home to teach in summer school instead of doing it in Canada at even the peak rate of \$1,000.00 for the job. It follows, of course, that no American scholar of senior rank or established reputation will come to a Canadian summer school for the sake of the salary (though a few may come for other reasons, such as a wish to travel and see new places). Equally any senior and capable Canadian, who wishes to increase his income by summer teaching, is foolish if he does not seek employment in the U.S.A. instead of in his own country. Further, the price any serious scholar pays for doing summer school is always a heavy one, for it involves loss of time which he needs for his own research. Hence the outside teachers whom Canadian summer schools are at present most likely to secure are those older men whose abilities and achievement are too slight ever to have got them into any college with a respectable salary scale, or youngsters who have as yet gained neither experience nor reputation. Neither class can be confidently expected to maintain high standards of instruction or to require high standards of performance (though the second class is likely to be much the better). The use of such teachers is in fact a dangerous thing just because they are so liable to damage those standards which it is in Canada's interest to uphold in her universities. In any case, even they are not numerous enough to make it easy for summer school directors to find bodies to stand up in front of summer school classes. In short, Canadian summer schools may soon be facing a crisis for want of staff. What is the answer?

The dictatorial mind will turn naturally to compulsion as the obvious and simple method to provide summer school staffs. It can be applied in three ways.

First, there is the indirect method. Demands can be made of department heads. The poor type of department head, strong in his influence over such matters as promotions or salary increases for his juniors, and eager to please those who can give or withhold benefits for himself, will then use pressure to compel his juniors to teach summer school, regardless of such personal considerations as the state of their Ph.D. theses (which so often can only be completed by steady grinding throughout the summer months). It is odious that such a practice as this should occur in a supposedly respectable society of scholars, however many department heads find browbeating their academic juniors a less exacting task than saying "NO" to their administrative seniors. Of course, any glib hypocrite can easily say to

an unfortunate junior, "But Mr., you must remember the university has a duty to the public;" he does not thereby justify his use of any form of pressure to compel Mr. to teach summer school. It is indeed true that universities do have duties toward the public; it is utterly false to suggest that any university or department has a right to perform those duties at the expense of its staff; and a university is doing its duty at the expense of its staff when it uses pressure to compel a man to teach summer school at a lower salary than he could gain elsewhere or to the damage of his research on which his standing in his profession depends, or even at the cost of his losing time he would wish to treat as holiday. The fact that summer school everywhere brings a separate and additional salary is sufficient proof that it is no part of the professor's normal duties.*

Secondly, a university administration could make summer school teaching compulsory by formally listing it as a required academic duty in all new contracts made with newly appointed staff. This, too, is odious for it must create, at least for a period of years, two classes of professors on the campus of any university which practises it. On the one hand there will be Grade A citizens on the old contract who are free to do as they wish — to teach summer school at home for the locally prevailing pittance, to go south and teach for a salary commensurate with their rank and reputation, or not to teach at all. On the other hand there will be Grade B citizens on the new contract which leaves them no choice in the matter. One can hardly imagine this happening at any decent university. It is nevertheless something for which faculty associations should be on the alert. It can be so easily, — even secretly — done; and (especially after the warning of the United College affair of 1958-59) it would be naïve to assume that all university administrators will necessarily be scrupulous to eschew furtive short cuts to administrative conveniences.

Thirdly, a university administration may negotiate a new agreement over summer school with the whole body of its academic staff. This had lately been done by one Canadian university, which has thereby secured the rights both to require its professors to teach summer school in two years out of every four and also to set two different salary scales for the same work, a low one for the locals

*The practice here complained of could hardly be attempted in those American and British universities which, instead of permanent, authoritarian "heads", have departmental chairmen and where the chairman is merely a temporary *primus inter pares* with a two or three year tenure of office. But few Canadian universities have as yet adopted this system.

and a relatively attractive one for visitors. In this case the manner in which the university concerned acquired the convenience of a cheap summer school with a captive staff was, of course, perfectly open and above-board. But what will it do to the university?

That question is, naturally, provoked by the suppositions that it is good for a university to have research done and good for a man to have holidays; and it is hard to see how both can be achieved in an institution where staff members are bound to teach summer school in two years out of four. No doubt some scientists may be able simply to withdraw to their labs and continue research projects as soon as they have dismissed their summer school classes. But unfortunately long years of conscientious thrift have left most Canadian libraries so weak that, particularly in Arts fields, men can rarely do serious research at home. The teacher of English, for example, is likely to need to spend much time at, say, the Huntingdon Library or the British Museum (and sometimes both) if he is seriously engaged in researching; members of French and German departments may be expected to need summers in France and Germany; economists should sometimes wish to take part in the Queen's summer seminar; historians will usually need to go at least as far afield as Ottawa, and often much further. Even in the Sciences some physicists are likely to want to spend summers at Chalk River, while zoologists and botanists often have research projects which require them to spend their summers in the bush or in the Arctic. In all these cases men must travel if they are to do research; and they cannot both teach and travel in the same summer. Further, it is usually a small research job that can be completed in one or two summers. Hence, if a man is required to teach in two summers out of four, he is unlikely to complete much research, unless he is ready to give up his holidays for several years together. All told, then, one fears that any university which requires two years summer school out of four is a university which will either shortchange its teachers in the matter of holidays or be shortchanged itself in the matter of research. One way or another, it is likely to become either an unhappy or an undistinguished place.*

*It is only fair to the university here discussed to quote the report, received verbally, that it does not intend to apply its "two-summer-out-of-four" summer school rule to "researching departments" (*sic.*). This suggests a welcome inclination toward intelligent compromise. One fears, however, that the words "researching departments" may prove easier to utter than to define; that definition may too readily lead to interdepartmental jealousies; and that any keen youngster joining a department whose head has no interest in research may find his position a very unenviable one. Accordingly, even the "not-for-researching-departments" amendment does not seem to make this summer school regulation a reasonable one.

Compulsion, therefore, is not an answer to the problem of staffing summer schools, however attractive it may seem to administrators who have been corrupted, as men proverbially are, by the exercise of power. The answer is this. There are some colleges in Canada which do not run summer schools; there are even more such institutions in the U.S.A., including some places of deservedly high reputation. The staffs of these colleges form a reservoir of teachers for summer schools. To get them it is only necessary to pay a fair competitive price, as some Canadian universities, following the late Dr. Sidney Smith's lead at Toronto, have recently begun to do in the matter of annual salaries. Such an appeal to the law of supply and demand can hardly be offensive as long as this country believes in free enterprise and is neither socialistic nor communistic. Till this law is observed by Canadian summer schools there is danger that unpleasant pressures may too often continue to be placed on junior men in departments; that outsiders hired to teach in our summer schools will too often be of inferior calibre; and hence that academic standards maintained at summer school may fall below those which Canadian universities very properly require in their regular winter session. One sixth of a man's regular salary would be a cheap price at which to avoid these evils; and the adoption of that proportion as a standard rate for summer school pay in Canada would simply bring our universities into line with what is already common practice in the U.S.A. One caution must be observed; Canadian professors would still be foolish if, in order to gain this commonplace American scale of remuneration, they bartered away their personal freedom to decide for themselves whether they would or would not teach in the summer months. A fair rate of pay is not something for which men should be asked to surrender liberties they have always enjoyed.

Group Insurance

is a valuable part of any employee benefit program
Those who enjoy the security of Canada Life Group Insurance
know that they have the experience of the oldest Canadian
life insurance company working on their behalf.

The **CANADA LIFE**
Assurance Company

SCHEDULE OF MINIMUM SALARIES IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES 1960-61¹

Arranged in order of the average salary for the top three grades.

<i>No.</i>	<i>University</i>	<i>Professor</i>	<i>Associate</i>	<i>Assistant</i>	<i>Lecturer</i>
1	Toronto	\$12,000	\$9,000	\$7,000	\$5,500
2	U. B. C.	12,000	9,000	7,000	—
3	Victoria	12,000	9,000	7,000	—
4	Saskatchewan	11,700	9,000	7,000	—
5	Manitoba	11,700	9,000	7,000	—
6	McGill	11,500	8,500	6,500	—
7	Western Ontario	10,500	8,500	6,500	5,500
8	Queen's	10,500	8,200	6,300	4,800
9	Carleton	10,000	8,500	6,500	5,000
10	Alberta	10,000	8,000	6,000	5,000
11	Laval	10,000	7,000	6,000	5,000
12	Memorial	9,500	8,000	6,500	4,800
13	Waterloo College	9,500	7,500	6,000	4,550
14	Dalhousie	9,500	7,500	4,500	3,500
15	McMaster	9,000	7,410	5,820	4,800
16	O. A. C.	8,200	7,200	5,750	4,800
17	U. N. B.	8,900	7,000	5,180	4,500
18	O. V. C.	8,200	6,900	5,500	4,600
19	Bishop's	7,950	6,500	5,500	4,300
20	Montréal	7,300	5,000	5,000	—
21	Mount Allison	7,000	6,000	5,000	4,000
22	St. Francis-Xavier....	6,000	5,000	4,700	4,000
23	Acadia	5,000	4,000	3,300	3,000

¹Unofficial reports from local associations.

MAPS AS GRAPHIC AS PICTURES . . .



GRAPHIC RELIEF MAPS . . .

present a comprehensible picture which lays a foundation for work in physical geography and map-reading. Used in conjunction with contour maps of the same area they can be a valuable aid to the teaching of contours. Each map has been specially drawn, the detail of relief being adapted to the scale employed. The colouring is green, grading to light and dark brown on the higher areas. Details of hill and valley are emphasized by the use of shadow and highlight. The principal geographical features, e.g. rivers, mountain ranges, plateaux, are named in a typeface that does not obscure the three-dimensional effect.

Each map is 34" x 42"

Titles available;—

Canada
United States

North America
South America

World
Europe

British Isles
Asia

Africa
Australia



MOYER VICO LTD.

MONCTON • MONTREAL • TORONTO • WINNIPEG
SASKATOON • EDMONTON



SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA is pleased to announce that the initial response to its Values in Education series has been more than gratifying. Hundreds of thousands of booklets have been distributed on request to all parts of Canada and the United States. These booklets, which are still available, deal with the advisability of remaining in school; existing scholarships and bursaries; technical and trade schools; school boards and their functions, and sports tips for teen-agers. Bulk shipments can be made to educators for distribution in schools.

Sun Life is now preparing a further series of booklets in its Values in Education series. 'How to Get More Fun out of School' is directed to the young teen-ager. It is hoped that 'The Value of a College Education' and 'Why Study the Humanities?' will encourage young men and women to attend university and help them in their search for their proper vocation. Two booklets have been prepared for adults—'Adult Education Today' and 'Educating Yourself for Retirement.'

Sun Life hopes sincerely that these booklets, and others to be issued in the future, will act as a stimulant on the young people of our nation and at the same time prove helpful to parents and educators alike in the performance of their duties. Sun Life will be glad to consider any suggestions concerning topics for future booklets.

SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

*Values in Education,
Room 218, Sun Life Building, Montreal*



Studies in Modern European Literature and Thought

General Editors: ERICH HELLER and ANTHONY THORLBY

Each \$1.35 & \$1.90

"To attempt at this tempestuous stage in the history of Europe a careful assessment of the work of writers and thinkers who have most influenced present tendencies... calls for extraordinary acumen, clear and unbiased judgement and an approach different from most... Professor Erich Heller has met the challenge nobly in this excellent series of monographs." *Journal of Education*

40 titles have now been published in this series, including volumes on:

BAUDELAIRE	GIDE	PROUST
BERGSON	HOLDERLIN	RILKE
CHECKHOV,	MALRAUX	TOLSTOY
CROCE	MAURIAC	VALERY
FLAUBERT	MISTRAL	SIMONE WEIL

Each volume contains useful appendices giving select bibliographies, chronological titles and translations from the original writings quoted in the text.

Examination copies available on request

For further particulars write to

BRITISH BOOK SERVICE (CANADA) LIMITED

1068 Broadview Avenue, Toronto 6, Ont.

CHEMISTRY FOR ENGINEERS

By EDWARD CARTMELL, B.Sc., A.R.I.C., University of Southampton.
Pp. vii+172+83 illustrations \$5.00 delivered.

This volume provides an elementary treatment of chemistry as a background study for all branches of engineering science. Contemporary views on chemical theory are presented in simple language; the fundamental principles being illustrated by carefully chosen examples of practical engineering importance.

THE PERIODIC TABLE — 2nd Edition

By D. G. COOPER, B.Sc., F.R.I.C. Pp. x+90+Index. \$1.50 delivered.

Early chapters of this pocket book are devoted to groups within the periodic table and later chapters discuss the table as a whole, the transition state and Fajan's rule. The book is ideally suitable for advanced teaching in high schools and for first year university students.

BUTTERWORTH & CO. (CANADA) LIMITED

1367 Danforth Avenue,

Toronto 6, Ontario.

Important Books

*about Our World To-day
and Tomorrow*

NOT TOMORROW — NOW

by A. C. Forrest

After visiting twenty-two countries in Africa and the Middle East, Mr. Forrest gives here a revealing account of his journey and a keen analysis of the current situation in this turbulent section of the world. Illustrated. \$4.50

*

NEITHER WAR NOR PEACE

by Hugh Seton-Watson

This is both a history and an analysis of world politics since the war. It deals with conflicts of nationalism and classes, and questions of international and social significance. \$7.25

*

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

by Leonard Schapiro

The author who is Reader in Russian Government Politics at the University of London, presents a factual, non-partisan and fully documented historical and analytical review of the subject. \$12.50

*

THE RIDDLE OF A CHANGING WORLD

by Sir Philip Gibbs

An outstanding journalist, writes with amazing foresight of the results of present-day scientific progress and the prospects of further developments. \$4.50

THE RYERSON PRESS

299 QUEEN STREET WEST
TORONTO 2-B, ONTARIO

MARTIN FRÈRES
CLARINETS
AND WOODWINDS

BUESCHER and LAMONTE
BAND INSTRUMENTS



**BUEGELEISEN &
JACOBSON LTD.**

7820 BATHURST ST. TORONTO, ONT.

GEO. L. HORNBERGER

Canadian Representative

*Write For Free Catalogue On All
Musical Instruments*

SEE YOUR LOCAL DEALER

Now Ready . . .

WEBSTER'S NEW COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY

(1960 copyright)

- A genuine Merriam-Webster product.
- The most complete handy-sized reference for college use.
- Available in dark blue linen binding, with specially made thin paper. Plain \$5.50
Thumb-indexed \$6.50.

Usual discounts

THOMAS ALLEN, LIMITED

266 King St. West

Toronto 2B

see how little
you pay
to fly **TCA** to
EUROPE
from Oct. 1st

\$
299

MONTREAL - LONDON
17-DAY EXCURSION (ECONOMY CLASS
ROUND TRIP)

From October 1st, you'll be able to take a trip to Europe for less than ever before. \$299, Montreal-London by propeller aircraft, or \$329 by jet. You save as much as \$122 over present fares! See your Travel Agent, TCA or BOAC soon, and choose from daily TCA-BOAC service to Britain (every day to London, six days weekly to Glasgow) or through TCA flights to Shannon, Paris, Brussels, Dusseldorf, Zurich or Vienna. There are low Excursion fares to all of them!

Sample fares:

MONTREAL-GLASGOW

\$272.00

MONTREAL-PARIS

\$338.60

MONTREAL-ZURICH

\$374.60

PROPELLER SERVICE, 17-DAY EXCURSION,
ECONOMY CLASS — ROUND TRIP

See your Travel Agent or

TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES  **AIR CANADA**

OFFICIAL SPEED RECORD HOLDER, CANADA - BRITAIN

ASK ABOUT TCA'S PAY-LATER PLAN

MADE IN CANADA

Northern Electric

SERVES YOU BEST

with

- COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT
- ELECTRICAL WIRES AND CABLES
- ELECTRICAL SUPPLIES
- ELECTRICAL APPARATUS

Ad. No. 6660-19

ANIMALS OF NORTH AMERICA
Animaux de l'Amérique du Nord



135

SPECIAL OFFER FOR TEACHERS ONLY



Save 50% or more on this special offer

ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA

For the first time, sets of Encyclopaedia Britannica are being made available at a special price to Canadian teachers in public schools, high schools, and universities. This is being done because the Encyclopaedia Britannica has always been deeply involved in education. As a teacher, you will find yourself referring to it again and again in the course of your work and studies. By passing on to your students the knowledge found in Britannica, you will not only provide them with important facts and information, but stimulate their interest in learning; and at the same time, you will add immeasurably to your own experience as a teacher. In case you are not completely familiar with Britannica, a colourful 32-page booklet has been prepared containing pictures, articles, and illustrations to provide complete information. And along with the booklet, you can obtain full details of this unusual money-saving offer available to teachers only. Incidentally, easy monthly terms are available, and there are no budget or carrying charges.

If you are at all interested, simply fill out and mail the coupon. You will receive a copy of the booklet with no obligation whatever. However, it is recommended that you mail in the coupon right away, since only a limited number of sets have been reserved for this special offer.

WHY SUCCESSFUL TEACHERS RELY ON BRITANNICA FOR FAST, FACTUAL REFERENCE

Successful teachers know *where to find* the answers to the bewildering, unpredictable, sometimes profound questions that spring from young inquiring minds. They simply look it up in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, and in doing so, set their pupils a wonderful example for the year ahead.

To the teaching profession more than any other, the Encyclopaedia Britannica provides a priceless source of knowledge. It is equivalent to a library of 1,000 books, bringing you the knowledge and authority of world-recognized leaders in every field. There—waiting for you with thousands of magnificent photographs, maps and drawings, is a world of information. In every respect, Britannica is the largest and most complete reference set published in North America.

The low priced Junior Britannica is also available. These books, designed specially for children, have proved most effective in stimulating an early interest in knowledge, and in providing a sound basis for higher education.

Britannica Special Offer for Teachers Only

ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA Dept. FT 8
207 Queen's Quay West, Toronto 1, Ontario

Gentlemen: Please send me, free and without obligation, your colorful Preview Booklet which pictures and describes Encyclopaedia Britannica in full detail. Also send complete information on how I may obtain this magnificent set through your special offer for teachers only.

Name.....

Home Address.....

City..... Zone..... Province.....

School.....

(PLEASE PRINT)